APPENDIX C

CONSULTATION PROCEDURES FOR SUPERFUND RESPONSE DECISIONS

Consolidated Guide to Consultation Procedures for Superfund Response Decisions Fact Sheet with transmittal memorandum dated May 14, 1997



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
SOLID WASTE AND EMERGENCY
RESPONSE

Signed May 14, 1997

OSWER Directive 9200.1-18FS

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Transmittal of "Consolidated Guide to Consultation

Procedures for Superfund Response Decisions" and FY97 Focus Areas for OERR regional coordination support

FROM: Stephen D. Luftig, Director

Office of Emergency and Remedial Response

TO: Director, Office of Site Remediation and Restoration

Region I

Director, Emergency and Remedial Response Division

Region II

Director, Hazardous Waste Management Division

Regions III, IX

Director, Waste Management Division

Region IV

Director, Superfund Division

Regions V, VI, VII

Assistant Regional Administrator, Office of Ecosystems

Protection and Remediation

Region VIII

Director, Environmental Cleanup Office

Region X

This memorandum: 1) transmits a completed fact sheet entitled "Consolidated Guide to Consultation Procedures for Superfund Response Decisions;" and 2)communicates the FY97 Focus Areas for OERR Regional coordination support.

Consolidated Guide to Consultation Procedures for Superfund Response Decisions

The goal of this fact sheet is to describe management review

procedures employed by EPA to ensure that national remedy selection policies and procedures are being implemented in a reasonable and appropriately consistent manner. EPA believes that consistent application of national policy and guidance is an important means by which we ensure the reasonableness, predictability, and cost-effectiveness of Superfund decisions. This document has been developed as a result of the National Consistency directive (OSWER Directive 9200.0-21) and the Remedy Selection "Rules of Thumb" Superfund Reform efforts announced by Administrator Carol Browner in October 1995.

This fact sheet provides a consolidated guide to EPA Headquarters and Regional consultation procedures for response decisions management. Pursuant to the final report of the Superfund Delegations Workgroup (OSWER Directive 9242.2-10), the Remedy Delegation Report was eliminated in favor of managing necessary Headquarters consultations through individual OSWER directives (this report had been used in the past to manage consultation requirements and procedures for Superfund remedy selection decisions). This fact sheet was developed to clarify and consolidate the various consultation procedures that have been established for both remedial and removal response selection decision making through various OSWER Directives, memoranda, and recommendations of national policy workgroups.

FY97 Focus Areas

As part of our effort to ensure appropriate national consistency, last year OERR established four technical and policy focus areas for Headquarters regional coordination efforts. The four focus areas include: 1)risk management and costeffectiveness decision documentation; 2)ground water policy; 3)lead policy; and 4) presumptive remedies. (See "Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making," OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996.)

In FY97, OERR plans to continue to use the focus areas and consultation procedures outlined in this May 1996 memorandum, and refined through your work with individual Regional Center management and staff over the course of the past year. The primary goal of OERR's regional coordination effort is to communicate and coordinate nationally on cross-cutting issues to ensure that we all share a common understanding of program policies and, as a result, approach site cleanups in a consistent manner. OERR staff will flag any inconsistencies with respect to focus area policies and will work with Regional staff on an informal basis to resolve these issues in a timely manner. At

the same time, Regional staff should look upon OERR staff as a resource that can provide assistance in working through issues as early as possible during the development of site response strategies and draft Proposed Plans.

Thank you for your assistance in recent efforts to promote appropriate national consistency. Please continue to contact my staff as early as possible in the response selection process as relevant issues arise.

Attachment

cc: Larry Reed, OERR
 Elaine Davies, OERR
 OERR Regional Accelerated Response Center Directors
 David Evans, OERR
 Suzanne Wells, OERR
 OERR Senior Process Managers
 Jim Woolford, FFRRO
 Liz Cotsworth, OSW
 Barry Breen, OSRE
 Craig Hooks, FFEO

United States Environmental Protection Agency Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response OSWER 9200.1-18FS EPA540-F-97-009 PB97-963216 May 1997



Consolidated Guide to Consultation Procedures for Superfund Response Decisions

Office of Emergency and Remedial Response

Quick Reference Fact Sheet

The goal of this fact sheet is to describe management review procedures employed by EPA to ensure that national remedy selection policies and procedures are being implemented in a reasonable and appropriately consistent manner. EPA believes that consistent application of national policy and guidance is an important means by which we ensure the reasonableness, predictability, and cost-effectiveness of Superfund decisions. This document has been developed as a result of the National Consistency directive (OSWER Directive 9200.0-21) and the Remedy Selection "Rules of Thumb" Superfund Reform efforts announced by Administrator Carol Browner in October 1995.

This fact sheet provides a consolidated guide to EPA Headquarters and Regional consultation procedures for response decisions management. This document was developed to clarify and consolidate the various consultation procedures that have been established for both remedial and removal response selection decision making through various OSWER Directives, memoranda, and recommendations of national policy workgroups.

NOTE: This fact sheet only highlights the review and/or consultation procedures that exist between EPA headquarters and EPA Regional offices for Superfund response selection decision-making. Every response decision goes through a rigorous technical and management review process within each Regional EPA office as well. The specific management review procedures are unique to each Region, and have evolved over time to reflect the best technical and program management expertise as well as the different organizational structures in each office.

FOCUS AREA REVIEW

In May 1996, the Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (OERR) issued a directive describing the goal of promoting "appropriately consistent CERCLA program implementation . . . and effective communication between Headquarters and the Regions" with a focus on four technical and policy areas. (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996).

The four focus areas include: risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation; ground water policy; lead (Pb) policy; and presumptive remedies.

The consultation procedures outlined in the memorandum involve the review of draft proposed plans by staff in OERR's Accelerated Response Centers. In some circumstances, OERR may request the review of draft decision documents such as Records of Decision (RODs), ROD amendments, Explanations of Significant Differences (ESDs), or Action Memoranda for non-time-critical removal

actions. Consultations are still required for non-time-critical removal actions costing over \$5 million (see SACM Regional Decision Teams and Early Action and Long-Term Action Under SACM, OSWER Directive 9203.1-05I, December 1992). Headquarters staff will flag any inconsistencies with respect to focus area policies and will work with Regional staff, on an informal basis, to resolve these issues in a timely manner. Issues of a national precedent-setting nature may be discussed with management as well.

At the same time, this memorandum encourages Regional staff to look upon Headquarters staff as a resource that can provide assistance in working through issues as early as possible during the development of site response strategies and draft proposed plans. The specific elements within each focus area are summarized in Table 1 and discussed in more detail in the May 1996 Focus Area memorandum.

HEADQUARTERS APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE ON REMOVAL ACTIONS

The Superfund statute established certain limitations on the use of removal actions. Some of the approval authority for exceeding these statutory limitations has been delegated to EPA Regional offices, and some approval authority remains at Headquarters. Table 2 lists the specific elements of the Headquarters approval/concurrence consultation process for removal actions.

CROSS-REGIONAL RESPONSE DECISIONS MANAGEMENT GROUPS

Cross-regional response decisions management groups have also been formed to share critical site information and improve remedy selection decision making. (See Table 3). Sharing draft proposed plans, decision documents, or other site-specific response strategies with these review groups as early as possible in the remedy selection process, will help facilitate a quick and efficient review.

The National Remedy Review Board was formed to promote cost-effectiveness and national consistency in remedy selection at Superfund sites. The Board is staffed with technical experts and senior managers from each EPA Region and several EPA Headquarters offices and focuses its reviews on high cost remedies. (National Remedy Review Board Progress Report: Fiscal Year 1996, OSWER Directive 9220.0-24,

January 1997; and *National Remedy Review Board Review Criteria for Federal Facility Superfund Sites*, OSWER Directive 9220.0-25, draft).

Lead is one of the most frequently encountered chemicals at Superfund sites. Lead cleanups are also some of the most costly cleanups. As a result, a Lead Sites Management Workgroup has been formed by the Superfund Waste Management Division Directors in order to have management level involvement in key lead site decisions across the nation. Criteria will be developed in the near future and will provide proposed action levels and/or risk management alternatives that trigger a review by this group. (Per direction of Superfund Waste Management Division Directors' Lead Policy Forum on February 6, 1997.)

CROSS-REGIONAL TECHNICAL REVIEW WORKGROUPS

Finally, cross-regional technical review workgroups have also been formed to focus on technical issues underlying risk assessment and response management issues. (See Table 4).

In order to support site-specific lead risk assessments and assist in the development of national lead policy for Superfund, the Technical Review Workgroup for lead was established. This group of scientists and technical experts is familiar with the development and refinement of the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model for Lead in Children (IEUBK) and provides advice on questions relating to site-specific lead risk assessments. OERR has asked Regional offices to identify any application of the IEUBK model that is expected to be challenged or will set a precedent in IEUBK model application so that the Technical Review Workgroup can be informed of the issues and provided an opportunity to comment on the approach undertaken. (Revised Interim Soil Lead Guidance for CERCLA Sites and RCRA Corrective Action Facilities, OSWER Directive 9355.4-12, July 14, 1994; and Administrative Reforms for Lead Risk Assessment, OSWER Directive 9200.4-20, April 17, 1996).

For sites where EPA is developing dioxin soil cleanup levels, OERR asks the Regions to consult with Headquarters and the Superfund Dioxin Workgroup as early as possible in the remedy selection process. This consultation process is needed to ensure a consistent transition in implementing the results of the Agency Dioxin Reassessment. (Headquarters Consultation for Dioxin Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-19, December 13, 1996).

POINTS OF CONTACT

<u>OERR Focus Area Reviews</u>: Contact staff in individual OERR Regional Accelerated Response Centers.

Removal Program Concurrences: Contact staff in individual OERR Regional Accelerated Response Centers.

<u>National Remedy Review Board</u>: Regional Remedy Review Board members or Bruce Means (OERR) at 703-603-8815.

<u>Lead Sites Management Workgroup</u>: Nick Ceto (Region 10) at 206-553-1816 or Shahid Mahmud (OERR) at 703-603-8789.

<u>Lead Technical Review Workgroup</u>: Pat Van Leeuwen (Region 5) at 312-886-4904, Paul White (Office of Research and Development) at 202-260-2589, or Larry Zaragoza (OERR) at 703-603-8867.

<u>Dioxin Review Workgroup</u>: Marlene Berg (OERR) at 703-603-8701, Elmer Akin (Region 4) at 404-562-8634, or Dwain Winters (Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances) at 202-260-8558.

EPA employees can obtain copies of OSWER directives cited in this guide by calling the Superfund Document Center at (703) 603-9232 or sending an e-mail to: "superfund.documentcenter@epamail.epa.gov"

1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) or Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA) Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1. Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation 2. Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions 3. Description of how response action will address risks 4. Description of other benefits of response action 5. Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2. Ground water policy 4. Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water 5. Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3. Lead policy 4. Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups	T		ı —	
OERR FOCUS AREA REVIEWS Levels of Management Review 1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) or Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA) Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies		1	2	3
Levels of Management Review 1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) or Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA) Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1. Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2. Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3. Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4. Presumptive remedies	TABLE 1	ъ		
Levels of Management Review 1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) or Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA) Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1. Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2. Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3. Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4. Presumptive remedies	OERR FOCUS AREA REVIEWS			
Levels of Management Review 1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) or Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA) Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1. Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation 2. Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions 3. Description of how response action will address risks 4. Description of other benefits of response action 5. Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2. Ground water policy 4. Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water 5. Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3. Lead policy 4. Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4. Presumptive remedies				A
2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) or Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA) Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1. Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2. Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3. Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4. Presumptive remedies	Levels of Management Review			
Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups		О		
Submit draft proposed plans¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups		N		
Areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups	5. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Ellief gency Response (AA)			
Areas: (Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making, OSWER Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups				
Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996) 1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups	Submit draft proposed plans ¹ to OERR Regional Center Staff for reviews in the following focus			
1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation • Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions • Description of how response action will address risks • Description of other benefits of response action • Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy • Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water • Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies				
 Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions Description of how response action will address risks Description of other benefits of response action Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies S 	Directive 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996)			
 Clear presentation of risks that justify action, using reasonable land use and exposure assumptions Description of how response action will address risks Description of other benefits of response action Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies S 	1) Risk management and cost-effectiveness decision documentation	c	C	
assumptions Description of how response action will address risks Description of other benefits of response action Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) Blead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups		ာ	ာ	
 Description of how response action will address risks Description of other benefits of response action Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (<i>Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites</i>, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies S 	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
 Description of other benefits of response action Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups S S 	•			
 Determination that effectiveness of response justifies cost 2) Ground water policy Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies 				
 Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (<i>Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites</i>, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) B) Lead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups B) Presumptive remedies 	•			
 Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (<i>Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites</i>, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) Lead policy Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups Presumptive remedies 	2) Ground water policy	S	S	
the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground Water Restoration at Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies	Consistent implementation of presumptive response strategy for contaminated ground water	b	5	
Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995) 3) Lead policy • Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies	• Consistent implementation of technical impracticability guidance (Consistent Implementation of			
S S S S Presumptive remedies S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S				
 Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups Presumptive remedies 	Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, January 1995)			
Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional technical and management review groups 4) Presumptive remedies	3) Lead policy	C	C	
4) Presumptive remedies	Consistent implementation of OSWER lead policy and coordination with cross-regional	3	3	
	technical and management review groups			
Appropriate use of presumptive remedies whenever possible	4) Presumptive remedies	C	C	
	Appropriate use of presumptive remedies whenever possible	3	3	
Consultations are still required for non-time critical removal actions costing over \$5 million (cos	Consultations are still required for non-time critical removal actions costing over \$5 million (see			
Consultations are still required for non-time-critical removal actions costing over \$5 million (see SACM Regional Decision Teams and Early Action and Long-Term Action Under SACM, OSWER	Consultations are still required for non-time-critical removal actions costing over \$5 minion (see			
Directive 9203.1-05I, December 1992).				

TABLE 2	1	2	3
HQ APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE ON REMOVAL ACTIONS	R	О	A
Levels of Management Review 1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) and Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA)	E G I O N	E R R	A
Removal Program Approval/Concurrence			
The Superfund statute established certain limitations on the use of removal actions. Some of the approval authority for exceeding these statutory limitations has been delegated to EPA Regional offices, and some approval authority remains at Headquarters.			
\$2 million statutory limit exemptions:			
 Emergency Exemption requests exceeding \$6 million Consistency Exemption requests for non-NPL sites All other exemptions 	M		M M
12-month statutory limit exemptions:			
All exemptions to the 12-month statutory limit	M		
In addition, the process for obtaining Headquarters concurrence on nationally significant fund-lead removal actions is described in <i>Guidance on Non-NPL Removal Actions Involving Nationally Significant or Precedent Setting Issues</i> , OSWER Directive 9360.0-19, March 3, 1989. Subsequent guidance has modified some of these consultation requirements (<i>Response Actions at Sites with Contamination Inside Buildings</i> , OSWER Directive 9360.3-12, August 12, 1993).			
1) Removal actions at sites within the United States or its territories involving contamination or response actions that may affect other sovereign nations, including Indian Tribes.		M	
2) Removal actions involving pesticide contamination arising from: a) improper storage of pesticide products awaiting indemnification; b) lawful application of pesticides, including special local use pesticides; or c) grain fumigation operations.		M	
3) Removal actions at sites involving any form of dioxin when it is one of the principal contaminants of concern.		M	
4) Removal actions at sites involving releases from consumer products in consumer use (e.g., lead-contaminated soil resulting from peeling lead-based paint on houses).		M	
5) Removal actions involving asbestos when it is the principal contaminant of concern.		M	
6) Removal actions involving substances or releases which may be subject to statutory exclusions or limitations in CERCLA.		M	
7) Response actions at sites with contamination inside buildings (e.g., indoor releases of mercury).		M	

TABLE 3	1	2	3
CROSS-REGIONAL RESPONSE DECISIONS MANAGEMENT GROUPS	R E G I O N	O E R R	A A
Levels of Management Review 1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) and Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA)			
1) National Remedy Review Board (National Remedy Review Board Progress Report: Fiscal Year 1996, OSWER Directive 9220.0-24, January 1997; and National Remedy Review Board Review Criteria for Federal Facility Superfund Sites, OSWER Directive 9220.0-25, draft).			
Response selection decisions for <u>all sites</u> (except DOE Radioactive-waste and DOD BRAC sites):			
Proposed remedy cost estimate exceeds \$30 million	M	M	
 Proposed remedy cost estimate exceeds \$10 million and is 50% greater in cost than that of the least-costly, protective, ARAR-compliant alternative 	М	M	
Response selection decisions involving <u>radioactive-waste at DOE sites</u> :			
Proposed remedy cost estimate exceeds \$75 million	M	M	
 Proposed remedy cost estimate exceeds \$25 million and is 50% greater in cost than that of the least-costly, protective, ARAR-compliant alternative 	М	M	
 2) Lead Sites Management Workgroup (Per direction of Superfund Waste Management Division Directors' Lead Policy Forum on February 6, 1997.) Proposed remedy involves national precedent setting issues 	М	M	

TABLE 4	1	2	3
CROSS-REGIONAL TECHNICAL REVIEW GROUPS Levels of Management Review 1. Regional Staff (S) and Management (M) (Region) 2. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Staff (S) and Management (M) (OERR) 3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (AA)	R E G I O N	O E R R	A A
3. Assistant Administrator for the Office of Sould Waste and Emergency Response (AA)	<u> </u> 		
1) Technical Review Workgroup (TRW) for Lead Sites (Administrative Reforms for Lead Risk Assessment, OSWER Directive 9200.4-20, April 17, 1996)			
Send all completed lead risk assessments which used the IEUBK model to the TRW. A review will focus on consistency with guidance.	S	S	
Identify for the TRW all IEUBK risk assessments that are either in planning or underway.	S	S	
• Identify for the TRW any application of the IEUBK that is expected to be challenged or will set a precedent in IEUBK application.	S	S	
Send any draft Regional guidance relating to lead to Headquarters for review prior to release.	s	S	
 Any IEUBK risk assessment with outputs that are outside the range of 400 ppm to 1200 ppm should be submitted for review. 	S	S	
 Any adult lead risk assessment that would suggest a preliminary remediation goal (PRG) output outside the range of 500 ppm to 2000 ppm should be submitted for review. 	S	S	
2) Technical Review Workgroup for Dioxin Sites (Headquarters Consultation for Dioxin Sites, OSWER Directive 9200.4-19, December 13, 1996)			
 Submit for review pertinent information for all sites where remediation goals are to be developed for dioxin in soil, regardless of whether dioxin itself drives the decision-making process. 	S	S	

APPENDIX D:

RECORDS OF DECISION AND OTHER DECISION DOCUMENTS TO EPA HEADQUARTERS

All Proposed Plans, RODs, ESDs, and ROD Amendments should be sent to the Superfund Document Center at EPA Headquarters within five working days after they have been signed. Signed RODs are abstracted for the ROD Annual Report and the ROD Database. Documents should be sent to:

ROD Clearinghouse Superfund Document Center U.S. EPA Mail Code 5202G 401 M Street, SW Washington, DC 20460

FORMAT

In order to ensure consistency and to facilitate duplication and readability, please read the following checklist and submit documents accordingly:

- Provide one clear, legible copy of the document (Proposed Plan, ROD, ESD, or ROD Amendment).
- Provide an electronic copy in the currently approved EPA word processing software.
- Follow the formats described in this guidance to the maximum extent practicable.
- Submit complete documents (*i.e.*, do not send sections separately).
- Submit clear copies (*i.e.*, legible and ready to be reproduced).
- Print on white, 8 ½" x 11" paper with black ink only (maps should be reproducible in black and white).
- Copies should be single-sided, unbound, and without tabs (please do not send bound copies).

- Landscape pages should be oriented so that the top (long edge) of the landscape page is placed on the left-hand side of the document.
- Every page should be numbered.
- Every page should have 1" margins on each side of the page and at least ½" margins on the top and bottom of each page.
- All documents should be single-spaced.
- For RODs and ROD Amendments, the signed and dated signature page should always be included. For ESDs, the publication or notice date should be included.

ATTACHMENTS, CHARTS, TABLES, MAPS, AND EXHIBITS

- All columns and text should be displayed completely.
- Computer printouts should be legible, especially cost estimate summary sheets. Dot-matrix printouts do not copy well.
- All tables, maps, and text should be on 8 ½" x 11" paper. Do not reduce documents; instead, have the documents reformatted.

ENFORCEMENT-CONFIDENTIAL INSERTS

 Enforcement-confidential pages should be labeled as such.

APPENDIX E:

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The following is a list of additional documents that may be useful in preparing Superfund decision documents or are pertinent to the remedial decision-making process.

- Administrative Reforms for Lead Risk Assessment (EPA 540-F-97-015, OSWER 9200.4-20, April 17, 1996).
- Answers to Comments Submitted After the ROD is Signed, October 11, 1995 (http://www.es.epa.gov/oeca/osre/951011.html).
- Application of the CERCLA Municipal Landfill Presumptive Remedy to Military Landfills (EPA 540-F-96-020, OSWER 9355.0-67FS, December 1996).
- CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual, Part 1, Interim Final (EPA 540-G-89-006, OSWER 9234.1-01, August 8, 1988).
- CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual, Part 2, Clean Air Act and Other Environmental Statutes and State Regulations (EPA 540-G-89-009, OSWER 9234.1-02, August 1989).
- Clarification to the 1994 Revised Interim Soil Lead Guidance for CERCLA Sites and RCRA Corrective Action Facilities (EPA 540-F-98-030, OSWER 9200.4-27P, August 27, 1998).
- Close Out Procedures for National Priority List Sites (EPA 540-R-95-062, OSWER 9320.2-09, August 1995).
- Community Relations During Enforcement Activities and Development of the Administrative Record (OSWER 9836.0-1A, November 3, 1988).
- Community Relations in Superfund: A Handbook (EPA 540-R-92-009, OSWER 9230.0-03C, January 1992).
- Considerations in Ground-Water Remediation at Superfund Sites and RCRA Facilities, Update (OSWER 9283.1-06, May 27, 1992).
- Consistent Implementation of the FY1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Ground-Water Restoration at Superfund Sites (EPA 540-F-95-001, OSWER 9200.4-14, January 19, 1995).
- Consolidated Guide to Consultation Procedures for Superfund Response Decisions (EPA 540-F-97-009, OSWER Directive 9200.1-18FS, May 14, 1997). Available as Appendix C of this guidance.
- Early Action and Long-Term Action Under the Superfund Accelerated Cleanup Model (SACM) (OSWER 9203.1-05I, Vol. 1, No. 2, December 1992).
- Final Guidance on Administrative Records for Selecting CERCLA Response Actions (OSWER 9833.3A-1, December 1990).
- Focus Areas for Headquarters OERR Support for Regional Decision Making (OSWER 9200.1-17, May 22, 1996).
- Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies under CERCLA, Interim Final (EPA 540-G-89-004, OSWER 9355.3-01, October 1988).
- Guidance for Data Useability in Risk Assessment, Parts A and B, Final (OSWER 9285.7-09A and B, April and May 1992).

- Guidance for Evaluating the Technical Impracticability of Ground-Water Restoration (EPA 540-R-93-080, OSWER 9234.2-25, October 1993).
- Guidance Manual for the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic (IEUBK) Model for Lead in Children (EPA 540-R-93-081, OSWER 9285.7-15-1, February 1994).
- Guidance on Implementation of the Superfund Accelerated Cleanup Model (SACM) Under CERCLA and the NCP (OSWER 9203.1-03, July 7, 1992).
- Guidance on Lead Determinations for CERCLA Fund-financed Responses (OSWER 9355.2-02, April 1992).
- Guidance on Non-NPL Removal Actions Involving Nationally Significant or Precedent-Setting Issues (OSWER 9360.0-19, March 1989).
- Guidance on Oversight of Potentially Responsible Party Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies: Volumes 1 and 2, Final (EPA 540-G-91-010a and b, OSWER 9835.1(c) and (d), July 1991).
- A Guide to Principal Threat and Low Level Threat Wastes (OSWER 9380.3-06FS, November 1991).
- A Guide to Selecting Superfund Remedial Actions (OSWER 9355.0-27FS, April 1990).
- Headquarters Consultation for Dioxin Sites (EPA 540-F-97-014, OSWER 9200.4-19, December 1996).
- Implementing Presumptive Remedies: A Notebook of Guidance and Resource Materials (EPA 540-R-97-029, OSWER 9378.0-11, October 1997).
- Incorporating Citizen Concerns into Superfund Decision-Making (OSWER 9230.0-18, January 1991).
- Institutional Controls: A Reference Manual, March 1998, Draft.
- Interim Guidance on Addressing Immediate Threats at NPL Sites (OSWER 9200.2-03, January 1990).
- Interim Final Guidance on Preparing a Superfund Memorandum of Agreement (SMOA) (OSWER 9375.0-01, May 1989).
- Internet Home Page for EPA's Technical Review Workgroup for Lead (http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/lead/index.htm).
- Land Use in the CERCLA Remedy Selection Process (EPA 540-R-95-052, OSWER 9355.7-04, May 1995).
- National Remedy Review Board Progress Report: Fiscal Year 1996 (EPA 540-R-97-001, OSWER 9220.0-24, January 1997).
- National Remedy Review Board Progress Report: Fiscal Year 1997 (EPA 540-R-97-032, OSWER 9220.0-26, February 1998).
- National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (The NCP) (OSWER 9200.2-14, January 1992).
- Presumptive Remedies and NCP Compliance (Memorandum from James E. Costello, Chairperson CERCLA Administrative Records Workgroup, ORC, Region VI, and George B. Wyeth, Office of General Counsel, June 14, 1995).
- Presumptive Remedies for Soils, Sediments, and Sludges at Wood Treater Sites (EPA 540-R-95-128, OSWER 9200.5-162, December 1995).
- Presumptive Remedies: Policies and Procedures (EPA 540-F-93-047, OSWER 9355.0-47FS, September 1993).

- Presumptive Remedies: Site Characterization and Technology Selection for CERCLA Sites with Volatile Organic Compounds in Soils (EPA 540-F-93-048, OSWER 9355.0-48FS, September 1993).
- Presumptive Remedy for CERCLA Municipal Landfill Sites (EPA 540-F-93-035, OSWER 9355.0-49FS, September 1993).
- Presumptive Remedy for Sites with Metals in Soils (forthcoming).
- Presumptive Remedy: Supplemental Bulletin Multi-Phase Extraction (MPE) Technology for VOCs in Soil and Ground Water (EPA 540-F-97-004, OSWER 9355.0-68FS, April 1997).
- Presumptive Response Strategy and Ex-Situ Treatment Technologies for Contaminated Ground Water at CERCLA Sites, Final Guidance (EPA 540-R-96-023, OSWER 9283.1-12, October 1996).
- Publishing Effective Public Notices (OSWER 9378.0FS, April 1997).
- Questions and Answers About the State Role in Remedy Selection at Non-Fund-Financed Enforcement Sites (OSWER 9831.9, April 1991).
- Remedial Action Costing Procedures Manual (EPA 600-8-87-049, October 1987).
- Remedy Cost Estimating Procedures Manual: A Guide to Developing and Documenting Remedial Alternative Cost Estimates During the Feasibility Study (EPA 540-R-98-045, OSWER 9355.0-10B-P, Draft).
- Response Actions at Sites with Contamination Inside Buildings (OSWER 9360.3-12, August 12, 1993).
- Restoration Advisory Board Implementation Guidelines (U.S. EPA and Department of Defense, September 27, 1994).
- Revised Interim Soil Lead Guidance for CERCLA Sites and RCRA Corrective Action Facilities (EPA 540-F-94-043, OSWER 9355.4-12, July 1994).
- Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund. Volume I. Human Health Evaluation Manual (PartA), Interim Final (EPA 540-1-89-002, December 1989).
- Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund. Volume I. Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part B, Development of Risk-Based Preliminary Remediation Goals), Interim Final (OSWER 9285.7-01B, December 1991). [Note: Soil Screening Guidance provides improvements in inhalation and ground water exposure pathway discussions.]
- Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund. Volume I. Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part C, Risk Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives), Interim Final (EPA 540-R-92-004, OSWER 9285.7-01C, December 1991).
- Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund. Volume I. Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part D, Standardized Planning, Reporting and Review of Superfund Risk Assessments) Interim Final, (EPA 540-R-97-033, OSWER 9285.7-01D, January 1998).
- Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund. Volume II. Environmental Evaluation Manual, Interim Final (EPA 540-1-89-001, March 1989).
- Role of the Baseline Risk Assessment in Superfund Remedy Selection (OSWER 9355.0-30, April 1991).
- The Role of CSGWPPs in EPA Remediation Programs (EPA 540-F-95-084, OSWER 9283.1-09, April 4, 1997).
- Rules of Thumb for Superfund Remedy Selection (EPA 540-R-97-013, OSWER 9355.0-69, August 1997).
- SACM Regional Decision Teams Interim Guidance (OSWER 9203.1-05I, Vol. 1, No. 5, December 1992).

- Site-Specific Advisory Board Guidance (Office of Environmental Management, Department of Energy, October 1998).
- Soil Screening Guidance: User's Guide (EPA 540-R-96-018, OSWER 9355.4-23, July 1996).
- Structure and Components of Five-Year Reviews (OSWER 9355.7-02, May 1991).
- Suggested ROD Language for Various Ground-Water Remediation Options (OSWER Directive 9283.1-03, October 10, 1990).
- Superfund Reforms: Updating Remedy Decisions (EPA 540-F-96-026, OSWER 9200.0-22, September 1996).
- Superfund Responsiveness Summaries (Superfund Management Review Recommendation Number 43E) (OSWER 9230.0-06, June 1990).
- Supplemetal Five-Year Review Guidance (EPA 540-F-94-044, OSWER 9355.7-02A, July 1994).
- Supplemental Guidance to RAGS: Calculating the Concentration Term (OSWER 9285.7-08I, Volume 1, Number 1, May 1992).
- Use of Monitored Natural Attenuation at Superfund, RCRA Corrective Action, and Underground Storage Tank Sites (EPA 540-F-99-009, OSWER 9200.4-17P, April 1999).
- User's Guide to the VOCs in Soils Presumptive Remedy (EPA 540-F-96-008, OSWER 9355.0-63FS, July 1996).